1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

| DEREK BROS, Plaintiff(s), |) Case No. 2:15-cv-02326-JAD-NJK) ORDER |
|---------------------------|---|
| VS. | |
| AARGON AGENCY, INC., | (Docket No. 30) |
| Defendant(s). |))) |

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend the discovery cutoff and dispositive motion deadline. Docket No. 30. Defendant filed a response in opposition, and Plaintiff filed a reply. Docket Nos. 33, 35. The motion is predicated on Plaintiff's contention that Defendant has been derelict in discovery, the subject of a separate motion to compel that is being denied without prejudice in an order issued concurrently herewith. Given the posture of the case and the possibility that Plaintiff's discovery efforts have been hindered by the pendency of the motion to compel, *see* Docket No. 30 at 4 (referencing possible delay of deposition of Defendant), the Court finds that it is in the interest of justice that an extension be provided. The Court will not allow the 60-day extension sought, however, and instead finds good cause for a 30-day extension. Accordingly, the pending motion is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part, and the following deadlines are extended:

- Discovery cutoff: August 25, 2016
- Dispositive motions: September 26, 2016
- Joint proposed pretrial order: October 26, 2016

Case 2:15-cv-02326-JAD-NJK Document 42 Filed 07/18/16 Page 2 of 2

To be abundantly clear, the Court is not inclined to grant a further generalized extension of the discovery cutoff even if Plaintiff's motion to compel is renewed and is ultimately granted.¹ In such circumstances, the Court will likely permit only a limited extension of the discovery cutoff (if necessary) for the particular discovery at issue in the disputed discovery requests.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 18, 2016

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The Court expresses no opinion herein as to whether any renewed motion to compel would be granted.